

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

These remarks are in response to the Office Action dated April 19, 2006. Claims 1-20 are pending. Claims 1-20 are rejected. Claims 1-20 remain pending in the present application.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102

The Examiner rejected claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Saeki (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0039730). Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiners rejections. The present invention provides a method for dynamically generating database queries. The method includes storing query web interface data, including attributes for a database, in one more tables; retrieving the attributes from the table and displaying the attributes on a graphical user interface web page for user selection; dynamically generating a SQL query based on the attributes selected by the user; and displaying results of the SQL query to the user in graphical format, thereby enabling dynamic generation of custom queries. Saeki does not teach or even suggest these features, as discussed below.

Saeki discloses a data retrieving method and apparatus, data retrieving system, and storage medium. In a data retrieving apparatus, a data dictionary is constructed so as to include definition information concerning tables, items and calculation syntax for representing an unnormalized data structure as a logically normalized data structure. A retrieval request designation control section interactively accepts a retrieval request from a user according to the data dictionary. A retrieval request translation processing section translates the retrieval request to a query statement, which a database can

execute, according to the data dictionary. The query statement is executed in a database retrieval processing section so that retrieval data is obtained. A data integration processing section integrates or aggregates the retrieval data according to the data dictionary so that final result data corresponding to the retrieval request is generated. A result data output processing section presents the final result data to the user. (Abstract).

Claim 1

Saeki does not teach or even suggest the combination of “storing query web interface data, including attributes for a database, in one more tables” and “retrieving the attributes from the table and displaying the attributes on a graphical user interface web page for user selection,” as recited in independent claim 1. Regarding the storing step of the present invention, the Examiner has referred to a “query statement” including attributes such as “AA,” “CC,” and “EE” in a “physical table” of Saeki, referring to Figure 8 and paragraphs 78 and 81 of Saeki. Regarding the retrieving step, the Examiner has referred to “candidate items which are contained in displayed tables,” referring to paragraph 87 of Saeki.

However, these sections of Saeki do not teach or suggest the present invention, because the “physical table” of Figure 8 and paragraphs 78 and 81 of Saeki is different from the “display table” of paragraph 87 of Saeki. The physical table of Saeki (bottom Figure 8) contains attributes such as “AA,” “CC,” and “EE,” and the physical table is relevant to the “retrieval request translation processing section” (Figure 6 and 8, paragraph 93). In contrast to the physical table of Saeki, the display table of Saeki is used at an earlier stage of the execution of the query, during a “retrieval object selection

section 111” of the “retrieval request designation control section 11” (Figure 4 and paragraph 87). The Examiner appears to be treating the physical table and the display table of Saeki as the same table in order to provide the storing and retrieving steps of the present invention. However, combining the physical and display tables of Saeki would be contrary to the teachings of Saeki, especially since the tables perform different functions.

Furthermore, Saeki does not teach or suggest “retrieving the attributes from the table and displaying the attributes on a graphical user interface web page for user selection” of the present invention, as the Examiner suggests. Paragraph 87 of Saeki states that the user “first selects a specific display table by using a display table index.” The user “then selects a display item from the selected display table.” This clearly teaches away from the retrieving step of present invention where attributes are first retrieved from the table and then displayed “on a graphical user interface web page for user selection.” In contrast to the present invention, Saeki merely teaches that the user selects display items directly from the display table, not from a GUI web page.

Accordingly, Saeki fails to teach or suggest the combination of steps as recited in independent claim 1, and this claim is allowable over Saeki.

Claim 15

Saeki does not teach or even suggest “using the inputs provided by the user to automatically generate a SQL query to retrieve data from a database,” as recited in independent claim 15. The Examiner has referred to steps 101-110 of Figure 6 and the abstract of Saeki as teaching this step. However, nowhere do these sections of Saeki mention using inputs provided by the user to “automatically generate a SQL query” as

in the present invention. Figure 6 of Saeki is directed to “a procedure to be executed in the retrieval request translation processing section 12.” Referring to Figure 1 of Saeki, this retrieval request translation processing section 12 clearly occurs after a SQL query is generated. The abstract of Saeki merely describes processes that occur after the receipt of a retrieval request. In other words, these sections of Saeki do not describe or even suggest how the SQL query is generated.

Accordingly, Saeki fails to teach or suggest the combination of steps as recited in independent claims 15, and this claim is allowable over Saeki.

Dependent claims 2-14 and 16-20 depend from independent claims 1 and 15, respectively. Accordingly, the above-articulated arguments related to independent claims 1 and 15 apply with equal force to claims 2-14 and 16-20, which are thus allowable over the cited references for at least the same reasons as claims 1 and 15.

Furthermore, regarding claim 2, Saeki fails to teach or suggest “displaying the attributes as a functionally categorized listing of query attributes.” The Examiner has referred to paragraphs 91-94 of Saeki as teaching this step. However, nowhere do these paragraphs mention this step. These paragraphs of Saeki merely describe a “retrieval request issuance section 114,” which is a part of a “retrieval request designation control section 11” (Figure 1), both of which process a user request that has already been generated. Saeki clearly fails to mention or suggest “functionally categorized listing of query attributes” as in the present invention. Accordingly, claim 2 is allowable over Saeki for at least this reason.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that claims 1-20 are allowable over the cited references. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and passage to issue of claims 1-20 as now presented.

Applicants' attorney believes this application in condition for allowance. Should any unresolved issues remain, Examiner is invited to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

July 14, 2006

Respectfully submitted,
Strategic Patent Group

/Stephen G. Sullivan/
Stephen G. Sullivan
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 38,329
(650) 969-7474